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I. Introduction
The Computer Science Department explains by means of this policy statement the procedures, criteria, and standards that it will use in the evaluation of:
1. Promotion of Instructors to Senior Instructor
2. Probationary faculty for annual appointment
3. Probationary faculty for tenure
4. Ranked faculty for promotion

Procedures used for annual performance review of faculty are explained in the CS-Merit Evaluation Procedures document.

Conditions for employment will be stated in writing in the initial appointment contract letter (2014 Faculty Handbook, Section 3.2.2). This policy statement further explains the procedures, criteria, and standards that the department will use in the evaluations listed above; it complies with the 2014 Faculty Handbook, Section 4.2. The faculty of the department in accordance with department policies has approved this statement. A copy of this document and of the CS-Merit Evaluation Procedure is provided to all faculty in the department upon joining the department and thereafter upon request. A copy is maintained in the department office.

II. Philosophy

Teaching, scholarship, research, creative activity, and service are the primary means by which faculty support the University's mission, and this policy is organized accordingly.

We recognize that scholarship is not confined to basic research; the 2014 Faculty Handbook, Section 4.2.2 defines scholarship as the discovery, organization, and application of knowledge. Computer Science combines aspects of theoretical science, experimental science, and engineering, and scholarship may be carried out in any of those facets of computing.

Furthermore, we recognize that collegiality is an important dimension in a faculty member’s contribution to the department and the University. We do not evaluate collegiality separately, however; rather, we follow the 2014 Faculty Handbook, Section 1.1.3.4 and the suggestion of the American Association of Academic Professors (AAUP) in considering that collegiality will manifest itself in the successful performance of teaching, research, and service activities.

Finally, in developing this policy statement, we recognize the distinctive characteristics of the computer science discipline. Professionals are often drawn to the computer science discipline because of the interest and excitement caused by the continual development and progress of the field. However, being part of such a rapidly developing field also presents challenges. Technology continues to advance rapidly, resulting in continuous changes in all aspects of computation, such as software environments, hardware design strategies, commercially-available
equipment, applications and usage models, intellectual property, language evolution and popularity, etc. The dynamic nature of the field of computer science must be duplicated in continuous and deliberate faculty effort to the end that curriculum, facilities, teaching methods, and course content reflect the state of the art. This demand represents a continuous challenge and burden to Computer Science faculty.

III. Procedures
The procedures for annual appointment, tenure, promotion, and annual review are spelled out in this document, Section 4 of the 2014 Faculty Handbook, and in the CS-Merit Evaluation Procedure document; deadlines relevant to these procedures are provided in the annual Faculty Evaluation Calendar. This document focuses on how the procedures are implemented at the departmental level. While this document and the others mentioned above describe the processes for evaluation and promotion, section 3.3 of the 2014 Faculty Handbook defines eligibility for tenure and promotion.

All new Computer Science Department faculty members are required to construct and maintain a professional portfolio of their activities. The portfolio should be initiated immediately upon employment, and maintained in a timely fashion. It is a required component of all applications for annual appointment, tenure, and promotion reviews as documentation of professional activities for the time period under consideration. For annual appointment, this is the preceding year; for tenure, the probationary period; and for promotion, the time at current rank. The portfolio may contain documentation of accomplishments prior to MSU appointment, but evaluations will emphasize accomplishments while at MSU. The portfolio should consist of the following:

- Curriculum Vita
- Teaching Activities; contents and documents are described in Section V
- Research and Scholarly Activities; contents and documents are described in Section VI
- Service Activities; contents and documents are described in Section VII

Each year, the department will consider any necessary updates and revisions to this policy statement; this will be done at the annual departmental retreat prior to the start of the Fall semester or at a meeting early in the Fall semester. The revised document will be forwarded to the Dean on or before the date specified by the Faculty Evaluation Calendar.

A. Department Personnel Committee
The 2014 Faculty Handbook (section 4.8.3) specifies that the Department Personnel Committee is comprised of all tenured faculty members in the department. The Handbook further specifies that a smaller subcommittee may be formed to carry out specific evaluation tasks. The CS-Evaluation Merit Procedures document details the way in which the Department Personnel Committee will carry out annual performance reviews.

B. Procedures for appointment at Senior Instructor rank
The 2014 Faculty Handbook (section 3.5.2) lists the criteria for an Instructor to be appointed as a Senior Instructor.
Because appointment at Senior Instructor rank constitutes continuing service at Missouri State University, the Computer Science Department will treat it as a promotion to be considered by the full Personnel Committee (all tenured members of the department). For appointment at Senior Instructor rank, an Instructor is expected to meet faculty expectations in teaching, listed below in this document; it is understood that an Instructor’s teaching may be narrowly focused on introductory and service courses.

An Instructor applying for promotion to Senior Instructor rank will submit, to the Personnel Committee, a portfolio including evidence of excellence in teaching and service (if appropriate), as well as any merit evaluations and performance reviews that have been carried out over the previous five years. The appendix to the University Policy for Promotion to Senior Instructor lists material that must be included in the portfolio, as well as suggestions for other material. The policy requires:

- A list of all courses taught, with their enrollments
- Syllabi for all courses taught
- A statement of teaching philosophy
- Examples of curricular materials (handouts, exams, assignments, etc.)
- Peer reviews of classroom teaching and instructional materials for all modalities, including online, if peer review has been carried out by the Computer Science Department
- Evidence of course and curricular development, as professional opportunities allow
- A summary report of student evaluations, as well as copies of all student evaluations

The Personnel Committee will recommend, to the Department Head, one of three outcomes: promotion to Senior Instructor rank, continuing appointment at Instructor rank, or termination of appointment. The Department Head will also recommend one of the three outcomes and will forward both recommendations to the Dean. If either recommendation (Personnel Committee or Department Head) is for appointment at Senior Instructor rank, the Department Head will recommend a term of appointment within the range specified by the Faculty Handbook.

C. Procedures for annual appointment of probationary faculty

Procedures for annual appointment reviews of probationary faculty are prescribed in the 2014 Faculty Handbook, section 4.6. The following describes how the Department Personnel Committee will carry out its responsibility in accordance with the Handbook.

The Department Personnel Committee will, in its annual performance review of probationary faculty, make a recommendation to the Department Head as to whether the faculty member should be reappointed. If a departmental subcommittee is responsible for annual performance reviews (fewer than all tenured members of the department), then that subcommittee will solicit input from all tenured faculty members of the department in determining its recommendation concerning appointment. For that reason, all tenured members of the department will have access to the materials submitted to the subcommittee by the probationary faculty member. Tenured members of the department will submit their recommendations in writing, providing reasons for their recommendations, and these recommendations will be forwarded to the Department Head.
in addition with the subcommittee’s written report. The process will then proceed in accordance with the Faculty Handbook.

In addition to its recommendation for annual appointment, in accordance with 2014 Faculty Handbook (section 4.6.3), the Department Personnel Committee and the Department Head will annually specify, in writing, one of the following three opinions:

1. Progress toward tenure/promotion is satisfactory
2. Progress toward tenure/promotion is questionable, identifying areas for improvement and providing specific suggestions
3. Progress toward tenure/promotion is unsatisfactory, providing specific rationale

D. Procedures for tenure/promotion review (promotion from Assistant Professor rank to Associate Professor rank)
The 2014 Faculty Handbook (section 4.6.2) describes the process for tenure/promotion review for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. The following describes how the Department Personnel Committee will carry out its responsibility in accordance with the 2014 Faculty Handbook.

The full Department Personnel Committee (all tenured members of the department) will consider applications for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. The probationary faculty member’s annual performance reviews will be one input to the process, along with other materials specified by the 2014 Faculty Handbook. The Department Personnel Committee will make a written recommendation to the Department Head, who will then proceed in accordance with procedures described in the 2014 Faculty Handbook.

Expectations for an early application for tenure/promotion are shown in the following sections within each category of Teaching, Research, and Service.

External review for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor will be carried out in accordance with prevailing University policy and the Faculty Evaluation Calendar.

E. Procedures for promotion review (promotion from Associate Professor rank to Professor rank)
Applications for promotion to the rank of Professor will be considered by a departmental committee comprised of all tenured members of the department faculty who hold the rank of Professor or Distinguished Professor. If there are fewer than two members of the department who hold those ranks, additional committee members will be appointed, by the Dean, from outside the department. The committee will make a written recommendation to the Department Head, who will proceed in accordance with procedures described in the Faculty Handbook.

External review for promotion to Professor will be carried out in accordance with prevailing University policy and the Faculty Evaluation Calendar.

F. Rebuttals
This document concerns rebuttals of recommendations concerning annual appointment, tenure, and promotion. The faculty member has the right to rebut the recommendation of the Department Personnel Committee and/or of the Department Head in matters of annual appointment, tenure, and promotion. A rebuttal of the recommendation of the Department Personnel Committee will be considered by the Department Head, and a rebuttal of the recommendation of the Department Head will be considered by the Dean.

IV. Allocation of Effort
Each faculty member is expected to allocate time and effort to a wide range of teaching, research/scholarship, and service obligations that promote the mission and goals of the University, college, and department. All faculty members have a right to know what allocations of effort are expected of them and to understand how departmental expectations, evaluative criteria, and performance indicators will be used in assessing their performance.

Sections V through VII below describe faculty expectations in teaching, research/scholarship, and service.

V. Expectations in Teaching
Teaching effectiveness by faculty is vital to the development and enhancement of the intellectual quality and academic integrity of the University. Achievement in this area is of critical importance to the department’s evaluation of faculty members who are under review for annual appointment, promotion, or tenure. Beginning in the first year of a teaching appointment, faculty must create and maintain an up-to-date teaching portfolio that contains written records pertaining to the teaching performance of each faculty member. The portfolio will be used by reviewers as the primary source of information for the evaluation of teaching.

A. Descriptions of Teaching activities.

1. Undergraduate and Graduate Teaching. The department considers high quality instruction to be a major component of a faculty member’s performance. Performance indicators used in the evaluation of teaching may include statements of teaching philosophy and pedagogy, self-evaluations of teaching effectiveness, results of student evaluations of courses taught, peer teaching observations and evaluations, documentation of student learning outcomes (such as results of standardized assessment measures, licensure or professional examinations, and graduate follow-up studies), supervision of student projects and theses, student enrollment and retention data, teaching awards and distinctions, and written statements from colleagues, students, and others concerning preparedness and effectiveness in teaching.

2. Instructional Development. Departmental faculty are expected to devote professional development efforts to continuously improve the curriculum as well as their own teaching methods and effectiveness. Performance indicators used in the evaluation of instructional development may include course outlines, syllabi, and other items that demonstrate the nature of instruction and range of courses taught, development of new courses or improvement of existing courses, including technology updates,
learning new hardware and software systems used in instruction, conferences and workshops attended, courses taken, or other professional development activities to enhance teaching skills, and innovations in the effective use and development of instructional technology and resources to promote active student learning.

3. Other Contributions to Student Learning. Faculty members make other contributions to student learning and development that fall outside the traditional domains of curriculum and instruction. Performance indicators used to evaluate such contributions may include being readily available to students (e.g. helping students outside of the classroom, regularly scheduled office hours, availability by email and voicemail, etc.), academic advising services provided to students, guidance of students in internships or co-operative work experiences, involvement in clubs, organizations, and activities promoting faculty-student interaction, involvement in activities to promote departmental programs and services to prospective students, and other pedagogical activities that contribute to effective teaching.

Standardized student evaluation forms are provided by the College. These forms must be used in each class taught by a probationary faculty member each semester. Requirements for tenured faculty are determined by CNAS policy; we encourage all faculty to use them for all courses. Faculty are free to supplement the standard teaching evaluation form with a form of their choosing. A summary of student teaching evaluations will be provided by the faculty member as part of any portfolio being reviewed for annual appointment, promotion or tenure. For appointment and tenure, this summary will include student teacher evaluations for all semesters at MSU. For promotion, the summary will include student teacher evaluations for all semesters at MSU at the current rank.

Other types of evaluations that may be used include results on standardized tests, interviews with students, analysis of grading practices, and so forth. Consideration will be given to any evidence of teaching performance which is submitted by a faculty member.

B. The Computer Science department encourages and expects activities that are believed to be effective, or are being investigated for effectiveness, in increasing student learning. Teaching activities should be appropriate to each course’s objectives and be measured by the course’s learning outcomes.

1. Toward the goal that the faculty member’s responsibility is to develop educated persons, the faculty member should:
   a. Clearly identify course outcome goals and activity outcome goals
   b. Clearly identify course content to major and general education curriculum
   c. Document student progress in knowledge and skills from initial baseline
   d. Pursue professional development in pedagogical skills
   e. Maintain up-to-date content and materials
   f. Determine and maintain appropriate level of course rigor and expectations

2. Toward the goal that the faculty member should make continuous effort to improve performance as a classroom teacher, the faculty member should:
a. Seek out best practices in teaching
b. Make use of peer teaching review and other direct feedback from fellow faculty
c. Earn positive student evaluations

3. Toward the goal that the faculty member should promote experiential learning, the faculty member should:
   a. Encourage and promote Service-Learning projects
   b. Encourage students to apply course content to external agencies, employers, contests, etc.
   c. Create opportunities for student participation in group and independent research and investigation

4. Toward the goal that the faculty member should be accessible to students, the faculty member should:
   a. Consider techniques and modalities other than in-class lecture by instructor that result in student exposure and absorption of course content
   b. Be imaginative in the use of technology to supplement traditional course material delivery while monitoring effectiveness
   c. Provide students with alternate means of communication and inquiry for course activities

5. Toward the goal that the faculty member should promote appreciation for diversity and professional behavior among computer scientists at all stages of their careers, the faculty member should:
   a. Facilitate professional development and growth of colleagues and students.
   b. Review the work of colleagues and students in an objective, documented, and dignified manner,
   c. Respond fairly and professionally to the questions, opinions, concerns, or complaints of colleagues and students.

C. Specific expectations in Teaching for appointment, reappointment, or promotion

Activity in the areas of teaching, service, and scholarly activity are expected of all faculty as a condition of employment.

1. Yearly reappointment of Instructors and Senior Instructors

   Minimum expectations include the following:

   a. Support the Computer Science department in its effort toward achievement of Program Educational Objectives and Student Learning Outcomes through Continuous Improvement.
   b. Excellence in teaching demonstrated by evidence that could include student evaluations, student outcomes and student performance, peer evaluations, the ability to advise and/or mentor students, the ability to contribute to curricular and
course development, and similar evaluations that may depend on an individual Instructor’s teaching assignments. Numerical teaching evaluations are only one component of the evaluation process. However, there is an expectation that the most-recent five-year average of the student evaluations should not be above 2.50 (on the scale of 1-5, 1 indicating the most valuable score); factors such as class size and class type may be taken into consideration if student evaluations are above 2.50.

c. Leadership in teaching demonstrated by ability to take leading roles in curricular and course development, to actively participate in and contribute to successful investigation of techniques and activities to support improvements in student learning, and to take on other teaching-related responsibilities that require initiative.

2. Promotion of Instructors to Senior Instructor

Minimum expectations include the following:

a. Support the Computer Science department in its effort toward achievement of Program Educational Objectives and Student Learning Outcomes through Continuous Improvement.

b. Excellence in teaching demonstrated by evidence that could include student evaluations, student outcomes and student performance, peer evaluations, the ability to advise and/or mentor students, the ability to contribute to curricular and course development, and similar evaluations that may depend on an individual Instructor’s teaching assignments. Numerical teaching evaluations are only one component of the evaluation process. However, there is an expectation that the most-recent five-year average of the student evaluations should not be above 2.50 (on the scale of 1-5, 1 indicating the most valuable score); factors such as class size and class type may be taken into consideration if student evaluations are above 2.50.

c. Leadership in teaching demonstrated by ability to take leading roles in curricular and course development, to actively participate in and contribute to successful investigation of techniques and activities to support improvements in student learning, and to take on other teaching-related responsibilities that require initiative.

3. Probationary faculty for annual appointment

To be minimally eligible for annual appointment, the candidate must show evidence of activity and accomplishment through the following:

a. Support the Computer Science department in its effort toward achievement of Program Educational Objectives and Student Learning Outcomes through Continuous Improvement.
b. Excellence in teaching demonstrated by evidence that could include student evaluations, student outcomes and student performance, peer evaluations, the ability to advise and/or mentor students, the ability to contribute to curricular and course development, and similar evaluations that may depend on an individual Instructor’s teaching assignments. Numerical teaching evaluations are only one component of the evaluation process. However, there is an expectation that the most-recent five-year average of the student evaluations should not be above 2.50 (on the scale of 1-5, 1 indicating the most valuable score); factors such as class size and class type may be taken into consideration if student evaluations are above 2.50.

c. Leadership in teaching demonstrated by ability to take leading roles in curricular and course development, to actively participate in and contribute to successful investigation of techniques and activities to support improvements in student learning, and to take on other teaching-related responsibilities that require initiative.

4. Probationary faculty making an early application for tenure

Minimum expectations include the following:

a. Support the Computer Science department in its effort toward achievement of Program Educational Objectives and Student Learning Outcomes through Continuous Improvement, including a thorough understanding of those processes and participation in their execution.

b. Excellence in teaching demonstrated by evidence that could include student evaluations, student outcomes and student performance, peer evaluations, the ability to advise and/or mentor students, the ability to contribute to curricular and course development, and similar evaluations that may depend on an individual Instructor’s teaching assignments. Numerical teaching evaluations on a five-year average of the student evaluations will not be available; however, the numerical teaching evaluation averages that do exist must meet the same expectation as that for tenure application at standard date. Evidence must be provided that the applicant has investigated and implemented best practices.

c. Leadership in teaching demonstrated by ability to take leading roles in curricular and course development, to actively participate in and contribute to successful investigation of techniques and activities to support improvements in student learning, and to take on other teaching-related responsibilities that require initiative.

5. Probationary faculty for tenure

Minimum expectations include the following:
a. Support the Computer Science department in its effort toward achievement of Program Educational Objectives and Student Learning Outcomes through Continuous Improvement, including a thorough understanding of those processes and participation in their execution.

b. Excellence in teaching demonstrated by evidence that could include student evaluations, student outcomes and student performance, peer evaluations, the ability to advise and/or mentor students, the ability to contribute to curricular and course development, and similar evaluations that may depend on an individual Instructor’s teaching assignments. Numerical teaching evaluations are only one component of the evaluation process. However, there is an expectation that the most-recent five-year average of the student evaluations should not be above 2.50 (on the scale of 1-5, 1 indicating the most valuable score); factors such as class size and class type may be taken into consideration if student evaluations are above 2.50.

c. Leadership in teaching demonstrated by ability to take leading roles in curricular and course development, to actively participate in and contribute to successful investigation of techniques and activities to support improvements in student learning, and to take on other teaching-related responsibilities that require initiative.

6. Assistant Professor for promotion to Associate Professor

The expectations in this area are the same as those required for tenure (see above).

7. Associate Professor for promotion to Professor

The expectations in this area are the same as those required for tenure (see above), with the stipulation that the activities are distinct from those for which tenure had been awarded.

VI. Expectations in Research and Scholarship

Research activities in the MSU Computer Science Department are expected to contribute to the theory or practice in the broadly-defined field of computer science through four recognized forms of scholarship: discovery, integration, application and teaching. We believe that students benefit from knowledge of areas of current topics of research. Whenever possible, faculty members should offer students an opportunity to participate in their research activities.

A. Definitions and descriptions of Research and Scholarship outcomes

1. Publications. Research activities and results may be disseminated in a number of ways. Publication in peer-reviewed journals (including electronic journals) or international conference proceedings is the most significant, particularly as evidence of the originality and importance of the work (scholarship of discovery). Refereed publications in regional conference proceedings, books, book chapters, and
monographs are also significant evidence of scholarship, as are reports that result from consulting activity arising from the candidate’s research expertise. Unrefereed publications are not acceptable.

2. Grants/Funding. Awarded funding (internal to MSU or external) is recognition of the validity of research topics and efforts. We also realize that external funding in computer science is less available than in some other scientific fields, and especially so for faculty in undergraduate programs. Pursuit of funding is a valued activity as described below.

3. Presentations at professional conferences or meetings. Invited presentations, workshops, and refereed presentations are valuable evidence of scholarship. Such presentations need not be published in a journal of proceedings.

4. Implementation or direction of computer science projects, including hardware/software design and production, development of programming languages, and so forth, may be considered applied research, depending on the nature of the project. Building a standard database for a community partner, for example, is not likely to be considered research, but if that database is designed or used in a novel way, it may be considered research. Student participation in these projects is highly encouraged. In evaluating the faculty member’s activities, the Department Personnel Committee and the Department Head will independently determine whether the project constitutes research and how it should be weighted relative to more traditional peer reviewed research.

5. Other research activity as demonstrated by candidate. This category provides an opportunity for a candidate to pursue other research interests which demonstrate his or her competence and capacity for research.

These research activities are expected to be documented in a portfolio that includes a copy of each publication, evidence of grant applications or funding, and a conference/meeting schedule for each presentation. The portfolio may also include documentation of any other research activities, such as samples of presentation materials, project software and reports, and evidence of the candidate’s other research activities not specifically defined above.

B. Encouraged activity in Research and Scholarship

1. Toward the goal that the faculty member’s responsibility is to expand knowledge and demonstrate growth in some area of expertise, the faculty member should:
   a. Actively and steadily pursue growth of knowledge in some field or fields of computer science
   b. Collaborate with colleagues inside and outside MSU with similar research interests
   c. Create, complete, and submit research writing for peer review and publication
d. Present completed research to appropriate venues, including journals, oral conference presentations, posters, etc.

2. Toward the goal that the faculty member should involve students in the research process, the faculty member should:
   a. Be prepared to encourage and mentor undergraduate students in independent study and graduate students in thesis research, including appropriate submission to publication if applicable

3. Toward the goal that the faculty member should pursue funding and financial support, the faculty member should:
   a. Develop and maintain a focused, demonstrable, and supportable research agenda
   b. Develop writing skills appropriate to funding proposals
   c. Be patient and persistent in the submission of funding applications
   d. Be prepared to administer and complete an awarded, funded proposal

C. Specific expectations in Research and Scholarship for appointment, reappointment, or promotion

Activity in the areas of teaching, service, and scholarly activity are expected of all faculty as a condition of employment.

1. Yearly reappointment of Instructors and Senior Instructors
   There are no expectations in this area for this appointment.

2. Promotion of Instructors to Senior Instructor
   There are no expectations in this area for this promotion.

3. Probationary faculty for annual appointment

   To receive annual appointment, a candidate must demonstrate engagement and breadth of activity in progress toward the expectations for tenure, as shown below. The department Promotion and Tenure Committee and the department head will complete an annual review of the candidate’s activities and/or a reasonably detailed and convincing plan of activities to be completed within the next year. Only in exceptional cases will a plan for activity be the basis of an annual appointment for more than two sequential years; a candidate for reappointment should not expect to rely upon annual submission of plans for activity in place of completed accomplishment.

   As described above, the department Promotion and Tenure Committee and the department head will specify, in writing, to probationary faculty whether progress toward tenure/promotion is satisfactory, questionable, or unsatisfactory.

4. Probationary faculty making an early application for tenure
To receive tenure, a candidate making an early application must demonstrate engagement and breadth of activity, since appointment at Missouri State University, by meeting the same expectation listed below for tenure application at standard date, including the accumulation of at least 20 points in the area of “national/international” publications for which the applicant is the primary responsible author.

5. Probationary faculty for tenure

To receive tenure, a candidate must demonstrate engagement and breadth of activity, since appointment at Missouri State University, through the accumulation of at least 50 points from among the activities listed below, including at least 30 points in the area of “national/international” publications.

Note that publications must be research-based and accepted by a peer-refereed, reputable journal. Publication in vanity presses, trade publications, campus or state journals, and in areas not well-related to Computer Science are not acceptable.

a. Research-based, peer-refereed publication in a “national/international” scientific journal or conference proceedings, for which research was substantially completed since coming to Missouri State University. A “national/international” journal is one for which the editorial board members’ institutions and (where applicable) rotating meeting location of the accompanying conference are located across the USA or a reasonably broad set of countries. (A book for which the candidate is primary author will be considered to be equivalent.)

Each instance: 10 points

b. Research-based, peer-refereed publication in a “regional” scientific journal or conference proceedings, for which research was substantially completed since coming to Missouri State University. A “regional” journal is one for which the editorial board members’ institutions and (where applicable) rotating meeting location of the accompanying conference are located within a region of a few states or smaller. (A book chapter for which the candidate is primary author will be considered to be equivalent.)

Each instance: 5 points

c. A properly-submitted, competitive, but unfunded external grant application in the area of research, scholarship funding, equipment, program development, etc., proposing an award of at least $25,000 and for which the candidate had primary writing responsibility.
Each instance: 3 points; at most 9 points count in this category

d. A successful, funded external grant application in the area of research, scholarship funding, equipment, program development, etc., resulting in a value to the Computer Science Department of at least $25,000 and for which the candidate had primary writing responsibility. The number of points for an activity will be evaluated by the department head in consultation with other faculty and will vary from 5 to 10 points per activity.

Each instance: varies

e. A substantial project or computer application which exhibits demonstrated impact and benefit to the Computer Science community and which has not been designated a point value in another category. The project will typically be open source, publicly and freely available, and support a popular text, curriculum, and classroom or research activity. The number of points for an activity will be evaluated by the department head in consultation with other faculty and will vary from 5 to 10 points per activity.

   Each instance: varies; at most 10 points count in this category

f. Supervision of undergraduate research in CSC 596.

   Each instance: 3 points; at most 6 points count in this category

g. Supervision of graduate thesis, including CSC 799 through thesis defense.

   Each instance: 6 points; at most 12 points count in this category

h. Other activity whose value has been negotiated and approved in writing by the Computer Science Department Head, who may consult other faculty.

   Each instance: varies

6. Assistant Professor for promotion to Associate Professor

The expectations in this area are the same as those required for tenure (see above).
7. Associate Professor for promotion to Professor

To receive promotion to Professor, a candidate must demonstrate engagement and breadth of activity, since appointment at Missouri State University, through the accumulation of at least 50 points from among the activities listed above for tenure application at standard date, with the stipulations that the candidate’s activities are distinct from those for which tenure had been awarded, and including the accumulation of at least 20 points in the area of “national/international” publications for which the candidate is the primary responsible author.

VII. Expectations in Service

The department defines service as performance of departmental, college, university, and professional activities which fall into three domains: involvement in the University’s shared governance, professional expertise shared with the internal and external community, and contributions to a faculty member’s profession. Such activities support the faculty role of facilitating student learning, broadly defined to include students, peers and the public. Prior to attaining tenure, faculty are expected to focus more on teaching and research than service. Nevertheless, a record which documents an appropriate involvement in service is required. For faculty seeking promotion to professor, a record which documents significant service to the University and/or profession is required.

In presenting their records of service, faculty members should include documentation which provides evidence of their activities and contributions. Examples of such documents include but are not limited to: records of membership and attendance at organizational meetings and events, documentation of significant contributions and leadership positions held, statements and testimonials from colleagues, committee chairs and others, and awards and recognitions.

A. Encouraged activity in Service

1. Toward the goal that the faculty member’s responsibility is to expand knowledge and demonstrate growth in some area of expertise, the faculty member should:
   a. Actively and steadily pursue growth of knowledge in some field or fields of computer science
   b. Collaborate with colleagues inside and outside MSU with similar research interests
   c. Create, complete, and submit research writing for peer review and publication
   d. Present completed research to appropriate venues, including journals, oral conference presentations, posters, etc.

B. Specific expectations in Service for appointment, reappointment, or promotion

Activity in the areas of teaching, service, and scholarly activity are expected of all faculty as a condition of employment.

1. Yearly reappointment of Instructors and Senior Instructors
There are no expectations in this area for this promotion.

2. Promotion of Instructors to Senior Instructor

There are no expectations in this area for this promotion.

3. Probationary faculty for annual appointment

To be minimally eligible for annual appointment, the candidate must demonstrate satisfactory service in departmental committees as assigned by the Department Head or elected by faculty.

4. Probationary faculty making an early application for tenure

Minimum expectations for tenure are the same as expectation listed below for promotion to Associate Professor.

5. Probationary faculty for tenure

Minimum expectations are:

   a. Satisfactory service in departmental committees as assigned by the Department Head or elected by faculty.
   b. Active participation and contribution as a member on one or more committees at the College or University level, as assigned by the Department Head or elected by faculty, for a period of at least four years among all committees combined.

6. Assistant Professor for promotion to Associate Professor

Minimum expectations in this area are the same as those required for tenure (see above).

7. Associate Professor for promotion to Professor

Activities in this area must be distinct from the activities for which promotion to Associate Professor had been awarded.

Minimum expectations are:

   a. Satisfactory service in departmental committees as assigned by the Department Head or elected by faculty.
   b. Active participation and contribution as a member on one or more committees at the College or University level, for a period of at least seven years among all committees combined and of which at least four years are on a University-level committee.
c. Leadership demonstrated by at least one of the following:

- one year as committee chair at the University level (which would also be considered to be a committee member for length of service time), or
- two years as committee chair at the College level (which would also be considered to be a committee member for length of service time), or
- three years in a leadership role in a professional organization when approved in writing by the Computer Science Department Head, who may consult other faculty. Professional organization service may include significant service to the computer science profession with a scholarly component, such as problem composition for contests, participation in accreditation or assessment bodies, etc.

VIII. Application of Policies
The policies set forth in this document regarding promotion will apply to all faculty. The policies regarding annual appointment and tenure review will apply to all faculty beginning employment in August 2012 or later. Faculty beginning employment prior to August 2012 will have the option of following the procedures outlined in this document or the procedures outlined in the corresponding document in effect at the beginning of their employment.
### Appendix. Summary matrix of expectations

#### Specific Expectations in Teaching for Appointment, Reappointment, or Promotion, section V.C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Criteria</th>
<th>Documentation or examples</th>
<th>Documentation Yes or No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support department in its efforts toward achievement of Program Educational Objectives and Student Learning Outcomes through Continuous Improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide evidence of excellence in teaching</td>
<td>Student Evaluations, Peer evaluations, Ability to advise and/or mentor students, Contribute to curricular and course development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide leadership in teaching</td>
<td>Take leading roles in curricular and course development, Actively participate and contribute to successful investigation of techniques and activities to support improvements in student learning, Take on other teaching-related responsibilities that require initiative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Specific Expectations in Research and Scholarship for Appointment, Reappointment, or Promotion, section VI.C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Criteria</th>
<th>Documentation or examples</th>
<th>Documentation Yes or No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grants/Funding</td>
<td>Internal to MSU or External</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentations at Professional Conferences</td>
<td>Invited presentations, workshops, and refereed presentations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation or direction of computer science projects</td>
<td>Hardware/Software Design and Production, Development of Programming Languages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Activity</td>
<td>Technology applied in artistic endeavors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Specific Expectations in Service for Appointment, Reappointment, or Promotion, section VII.B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Criteria</th>
<th>Documentation or examples</th>
<th>Documentation Yes or No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service in departmental committees as assigned by the Department Head or elected by faculty</td>
<td>List committees and role</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation and membership on College and/or University committees</td>
<td>List committees and role</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership of College and/or University committees or leadership of professional organization</td>
<td>List committees and role</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>